

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-51 and 61-72 are pending in the application. Following entry of this claim listing above, claims 1-51 and 61-83 will be pending in the application. Claims 1, 11-13, 16, 18, 19, 28-30, 33, 35, 38, 40, 43, 45, 47, 50, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Primak et al. (Pub. No. 2001/0039585) (hereinafter "Primak"). Claims 2-7, 20-24, 32, 36, 39, 41, 44, 46, 48, 51, 52, 55, and 58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Primak. Claims 17 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Primak in view of Meek et al. (USPN 6,539,426). Claims 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Primak in view of Lin et al. (USPN 6,298,451). Claims 8-10, 25-27, 37, 42, and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Primak in view of Guenthner et al. (USPN 6,134,588).

Claims 52, 55 and 58 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 19, 35, 40, 45 and 47 have been amended. Claims 47 and 48 have been amended to clarify the invention. Specifically, the phrase "one or more processors" has been added to claims 47 and 48. Support for these claims amendments can be found at least on page 13, lines 3 through 6 as originally filed. Claims 73-83 have been added. Support for these new claims can be found at least on page 5, lines 6 through 15 as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by way of amendments or new claims.

During an Examiner's Interview on December 6, 2005, the Examiner suggested claim amendments for claim 1 to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Primak. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the helpful, suggested, claim amendment ("other than the central server"). Claim 1 has been amended to be consistent with the Examiner's suggestion. Parallel claims 19, 35, 40, 45 and 47 are being amended in a similar manner.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 19, 35, 40, 45 and 47 should now overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Because claims 11-13, 16, 18, 19, 28-30, 33, 35, 38, 40, 43, 45, 47, 50, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72 depend from the now amended independent claims, these claims should be allowed under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for at least the same reasons.

Claims 52, 55 and 58 are being cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 are moot. Because claims 2-10, 17, 20-27, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, and 71 depend from the now amended independent claims, these claims should now overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 for at least the same reasons.

Information Disclosure Statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) is being filed concurrently herewith. Entry of the IDS is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all now pending claims (claims 1-51 and 61-83) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mark B. Solomon  
Mark B. Solomon  
Registration No. 44,348  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 12/7/05